IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN

MONDAY, THE 21ST AUGUST 2006 / 30TH SRAVANA 1928

RP.No. 713 of 2006(I)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.18142/2006
.....

: REVIEW PETITIONER/RESPONDENT IN WPC

K.N.S.NAIR,
RECOVERY OFFICER, DEBTS RECOVERY TRIBUNAL,
KERALA LAKSWADEEP, 8TH FLOOR,
KSHB BUILDING, PANAMPALLY NAGAR, COCHIN-36.

BY ADV. SRI.AJESH. M.R.
SRI.TITUS THOMAS

RESPONDENTS: WRIT PETITIONERS

---

1. MATHEW THOMAS,
SOLE PROPRIETOR, M/S. CENTRAL RUBBERS,
RESIDING AT MOLOPARAMBIL HOUSE,
VILAKKUMARATHU, POOVARANI P.O.,
PALAI, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

2. LEELAMMA MATHEW, W/O. MATHEW THOMAS,
RESIDING AT MOLOPARAMBIL HOUSE,
VILAKKUMARATHU, POOVARANI P.O.,
PALAI, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

3. MARY THOMAS, W/O. THOMAS,
RESIDING AT MOLOPARAMBIL HOUSE,
VILAKKUMARATHU, POOVARANI P.O.,
PALAI, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.K.G.ANIL BABU

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 21/08/2006, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

THOTTATHIL B RADHAKRISHNAN, J

==========

R.P NO.713 Of 2006

In

W.P.C.No.18142 of 2006

==========

Dated this the 21st day of August, 2006

O R D E R

Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the review petitioner was shown by name as the respondent in the writ petition for the purpose of identification of the officer before whom Ext.P1 is pending, since recovery proceedings are listed before two different Recovery Officers in the DRT. He also submits that it is only for that reason that Ext.P2 is also shown to have been presented for consideration of the Recovery Officer, who has issued Ext.P1. The learned counsel for the writ petitioner further submits that no personal allegations are levelled against the review petitioner, Sri.K.N.S. Nair and that these factors were pointed out even at the time of admission when clarifications were sought for at that stage, by the Bench, from the learned counsel for the petitioner.

In the aforesaid circumstances, the review petition is disposed of clarifying that there are no personal attributes against the review petitioner and the impleadment was only for the purposes as aforesaid.

THOTTATHIL B. RADHAKRISHNAN, JUDGE

SJ